

# The Catholic Educational Review

JUNE, 1924

## CHURCH MEMBERSHIP AND THE PROBLEM OF ILLITERACY

No thoughtful Catholic can view with unconcern the numerous and persistent attacks that are being made against our rights to maintain a system of schools which accord with our religious convictions and ideals. The attacks vary in form and method, but there is no mistaking their aim, which is to arouse popular opinion by representing, or rather misrepresenting, our schools as a national menace.

One of the most recent of these attacks made in a widely read monthly endeavors to show that there is a close relationship between Catholicity and illiteracy and insinuates that this relationship is by no means fortuitous. The method is simple. The writer selects two states, Louisiana and Iowa. The former is largely Catholic and has the largest percentage of illiterates of any state in the Union; the latter, on the other hand, is a Protestant state and has the lowest percentage of illiterates. Ergo, Catholicity stands for illiteracy and Protestantism stands for literacy, enlightenment, true Americanism, and all other good things. What further proof is needed? Well, to clinch the argument, as it were, it remains but to point out that New Mexico, which has also a large percentage of Catholics, has likewise a large percentage of illiterates. To the uncritical reader, who is not troubled about such trifling matters as the neglect of negative instances, all this seems quite plausible, and not a few well-meaning people are biased as a result of reading such specious arguments.

If there is any truth in this contention, it is just as well that Catholics should know the exact facts and face them courage-

ously. It serves no useful purpose to keep on living in a fool's paradise from which we may get a rude awakening. But the question that presents itself is whether the facts justify the conclusion that there is a necessary and casual connection between Catholicity and illiteracy. To answer such a question we must obviously make ourselves acquainted with the facts and then interpret them correctly. Furthermore, to get the full facts we must investigate the educational situation, not merely in two or three selected states, but in *every* state in the Union. Then, and not till then, can we form an adequate judgment as to the exact relationship between Catholicity and illiteracy, whether real or imaginary.

An unbiased investigator, if asked to account for illiteracy, might well hesitate to attribute it to a single cause. He would be too conscious of the complexity of the problem to make any pretension to that type of intuitive omniscience which appears to have been monopolized by a few of our popular writers. However, many explanations, or partial explanations, would naturally suggest themselves to account for the fact that certain states and sections of the country have more illiterates than others. Before reaching a final conclusion an investigator would study the educational history of a particular state and try to understand its economic problems. He might be inclined to think that a sparsely settled state is considerably handicapped. The date of the state's admission might also be considered, as well as the educational antecedents of recent immigrants and their relative numbers. He would possibly attach some importance to the distribution of the population in urban and rural centers. He could hardly be blind to the fact that a large colored population constitutes a problem which cannot be ignored.

These and many other questions must be studied before one can speak with any degree of assurance about the real cause, or causes, of illiteracy. Our present problem is more limited in scope; it is simply to determine whether there are any valid reasons for associating Catholicity with illiteracy and Protestantism with literacy in these United States.

All the relevant data are supplied in the following table. The first column of figures gives the total number of church members, Catholics and Protestants combined; the second column gives

TABLE SHOWING THE COMPARATIVE STRENGTH OF CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP WITH THE PERCENTAGES OF CATHOLICS AND THE PERCENTAGES OF ILLITERATES GIVEN IN PARALLEL COLUMNS IN THE DIFFERENT STATES AND DIVISIONS OF THE UNION.

States and divisions	All Christian denominations	Roman Catholics	Per cent of Roman Catholics	Per cent of illiterates
<i>New England:</i>				
Maine.....	255,293	148,530	58.1	3.3
New Hampshire.....	210,736	136,020	64.5	4.4
Vermont.....	145,682	78,178	53.6	3.0
Massachusetts.....	1,977,482	1,410,208	71.3	4.7
Rhode Island.....	344,060	261,312	75.9	6.5
Connecticut.....	724,692	483,834	66.8	6.2
	3,657,945	2,518,082	68.8	4.9
<i>Middle Atlantic:</i>				
New York.....	4,315,404	2,745,552	63.6	5.1
New Jersey.....	1,337,983	790,764	59.2	5.1
Pennsylvania.....	4,114,527	1,830,532	44.4	4.6
	9,767,914	5,336,848	54.9	4.9
<i>East N. Central:</i>				
Ohio.....	2,291,793	843,856	36.8	2.8
Indiana.....	1,777,341	272,288	15.3	2.2
Illinois.....	2,522,373	1,171,381	46.4	3.4
Michigan.....	1,181,431	572,117	48.4	3.0
Wisconsin.....	1,162,032	594,836	51.1	2.4
	8,934,970	3,454,478	38.6	2.9
<i>West N. Central:</i>				
Minnesota.....	931,388	415,664	44.0	1.8
Iowa.....	937,334	262,513	28.0	1.1
Missouri.....	1,370,551	445,352	32.4	3.0
North Dakota.....	225,877	95,857	42.4	2.1
South Dakota.....	199,017	72,113	36.2	1.7
Nebraska.....	440,791	135,537	30.7	1.4
Kansas.....	610,347	128,948	21.1	1.6
	4,715,295	1,555,984	32.9	2.0
<i>South Atlantic:</i>				
Delaware.....	86,524	30,183	45.9	5.9
Maryland.....	602,589	219,530	36.4	5.6
District of Columbia.....	164,413	51,421	31.3	2.8
Virginia.....	949,136	36,671	3.8	11.2
West Virginia.....	427,865	60,337	14.1	6.4
North Carolina.....	1,080,723	4,989	0.4	13.1
South Carolina.....	794,126	9,514	1.2	18.1
Georgia.....	1,234,132	18,214	1.5	15.3
Florida.....	324,856	24,650	7.6	9.6
	5,664,364	455,509	8.4	11.5
<i>E. South Central:</i>				
Kentucky.....	967,602	160,185	16.5	8.4
Tennessee.....	840,133	23,015	2.7	7.4
Alabama.....	1,009,465	37,482	3.7	16.1
Mississippi.....	762,977	32,160	4.2	17.2
	3,580,177	252,842	7.6	12.7
<i>W. South Central:</i>				
Arkansas.....	583,209	21,120	3.6	9.4
Louisiana.....	863,910	509,910	61.8	21.9
Oklahoma.....	424,492	47,427	11.1	3.8
Texas.....	1,784,620	402,874	22.6	8.3
	3,656,231	981,331	26.8	10.0

NOTE.—The figures for 1919 were taken from *The World Almanac*, p. 179, which cites *The Year Book of the Churches* for the figures given above. The sources of the other data have been already indicated.

States and divisions	All Christian denominations	Roman Catholics	Per cent of Roman Catholics	Per cent of illiterates
<i>Mountain Division:</i>				
Montana.....	137,566	78,113	56.7	2.3
Idaho.....	135,386	17,947	13.7	1.5
Wyoming.....	39,505	12,801	32.4	1.5
Colorado.....	257,977	104,982	46.9	3.2
New Mexico.....	209,809	177,729	84.2	15.6
Arizona.....	117,014	84,742	72.4	15.3
Utah.....	280,848	10,000	3.6	1.9
Nevada.....	16,145	8,742	54.0	5.9
	1,204,250	495,056	41.1	5.2
<i>Pacific Division:</i>				
Washington.....	283,709	97,418	24.3	1.7
Oregon.....	179,468	49,728	22.1	1.5
California.....	893,366	494,539	55.4	3.3
	1,356,543	641,685	47.3	2.7
<i>United States:</i>				
(In 1916).....	42,547,589	15,721,815	36.9	....
(In 1919).....	43,529,780	17,549,324	40.3	....
(In 1920).....	.....	.....	....	6.0

the number of Roman Catholics only. These figures are taken from *The World Almanac and Encyclopedia*, 1921, page 178, and are a reprint from the latest special United States Religious Census giving the church members in the United States for 1916. In the third column is given the percentage of Catholics to the total church membership, these percentages being calculated to the nearest tenth from the numbers in columns one and two. The fourth column gives the percentage of illiterates for the different states and divisions of the nation, and the figures are taken from the Federal Census of the United States for 1920. It would have been more satisfactory if the religious census for the same year had been available, but while there would be an increase in the totals in both columns one and two, there would be relatively little difference in the percentages in column three, that is to say the relative proportions would be unchanged for all practical purposes. Where a change would occur it would tend to increase, rather than decrease, the proportion of Catholics. This assertion is supported by the figures given in *The Year Book of the Churches* for 1919, which shows that in 1919 Catholics formed 40.3 per cent of the total church membership, whereas according to the source cited for the figures for 1916 the Catholic percentage was 36.9 of the total.

It should be noted that, according to the sources used, less than half of the entire population of the United States claims



church membership, so that when the percentage of Catholics appears quite high in certain states the reader will bear in mind that the comparison is made, not with the total population of the state, but with the total church membership of the state. Keeping in mind the problem under investigation this would appear to be a fair and reasonable basis for comparison. At least the writer has been unable to find a more satisfactory one.

If the reader will refer to the accompanying table, he can make many interesting comparisons for himself, but it is doubtful if he will find any evidence whatsoever to support the thesis that Catholicity and illiteracy are in any way closely related. Indeed, the writer has taken the trouble to calculate by a rigorous statistical method the coefficient of correlation between Catholicity and illiteracy on the basis of the figures given in this table and he finds the correlation, if any, is negative. To be quite accurate the coefficient of correlation when calculated by Spearman's formula is minus .08 with a probable error of .06. That is to say there is no significant correlation whatever, any more than there is between men's bank accounts and their heights.

For those who prefer less technical language the following comparisons and contrasts are not without interest. In the first place it will be noted that is no less than fifteen states Catholics form a majority of the church members. These states ranked in descending order are: New Mexico, Rhode Island, Arizona, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, Louisiana, New Jersey, Maine, Montana, California, Nevada, Vermont, and Wisconsin. The percentage of Catholics ranges from 84.2 in New Mexico to 51.1 in Wisconsin with a median Catholic church membership of 61.8 and the median percentage of illiteracy is 5.1.

Now let us turn to the fifteen most Protestant states. These ranked in descending order are: North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Arkansas, Utah, Alabama, Virginia, Mississippi, Florida, Oklahoma, Idaho, West Virginia, Indiana, and Kentucky. The percentage of Protestants ranges from 99.6 in North Carolina to 83.5 in Kentucky with a median percentage of Protestant church membership of 96.2, and the median percentage of illiteracy is 13.0. In other words these fifteen intensely Protestant states have a median percentage of illiteracy which is

*more than two and one-half times* as high as that of the fifteen most Catholic states. In the remaining eighteen states Catholics form a substantial minority, hence these states do not serve as a fair basis of comparison.

Referring once more to the fifteen most Catholic states, it will be noticed that in all but three the percentage of illiteracy is comparatively low. The Census returns show that in twelve of these fifteen states the percentage of illiterates among native-born white, whether of native or foreign parentage, is *less than one per cent*, such illiteracy as exists being due chiefly to foreign-born immigrants. If we contrast the percentage of illiteracy among the native-born whites of these twelve states with the percentage of illiteracy among native whites of the twelve Protestant states which are located in the south and enumerated in the above list, it will be found *these intensely Protestant states have seven times as many illiterates*.

Another interesting comparison may be made between the three Catholic states which have the highest percentage of illiterates and the three Protestant states which make the poorest showing in the same respect. The Catholic states are Louisiana, New Mexico, and Arizona; the corresponding Protestant states are North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Louisiana, it is true, has the highest percentage of illiteracy, 21.9 per cent, but it should also be remembered that *Louisiana has a large colored population of whom 38.5 per cent are illiterate*: this, of course, raises the total percentage of illiteracy. New Mexico with 15.6 per cent of illiterates and Arizona with 15.3 per cent have a large percentage of foreign-born illiterates, mainly Mexicans.

Turning now to the three most intensely Protestant states which also rank among the more illiterate states, we find that North Carolina's illiteracy is 13.1 per cent, Georgia's is 15.3 per cent, and South Carolina's is 18.1 per cent. Some of the other southern states are equally bad; for example, Alabama has 16.1 per cent illiteracy, and Mississippi has 17.2 per cent. As Catholics form scarcely 1 per cent of the population in the three most Protestant states, they can hardly be blamed for the high percentage of illiteracy. Indeed, *the total number of illiterates in these three states is more than double the illiterate population in the three most illiterate Catholic states already*

mentioned. Hence we may conclude that the question of illiteracy in the more Catholic states is a much less serious one than that confronting the Protestant states of the south.

It is interesting to notice that Louisiana, instead of ranking first for Catholic membership, as is commonly supposed, actually ranks eighth among Catholic states; and Iowa, instead of being the leading Protestant state, has a Catholic membership of 28 per cent of the total church membership and ranks twentieth among the Protestant states. North Carolina leads the Protestant states with a Catholic population which is less than half of 1 per cent. These facts are rather awkward for a writer who is trying to build up a comfortable theory about Protestant superiority and Catholic inferiority. It is so pleasing to have to record that Protestant (?) Iowa has only 1.1 per cent of illiterates, whereas a moment's inspection of the Census returns would reveal the fact that six overwhelmingly Protestant states have illiteracy percentages ranging from 11.2 to 18.1.

Certain writers have tried to create a scare about what they call the peril of immigration, especially if a large percentage of that immigration includes Catholics. If this were the only peril our country had to fear, there would be less cause for alarm. How writers can be so obviously unfair and yet succeed in having their articles accepted raises an interesting question in American social psychology which cannot be developed in the present connection. If the general body of readers were critically minded, such articles would do little harm and might be read as examples of a form of dry humor, a sly attempt to poke fun at statistics. Unfortunately, however, unproved assertions are accepted without question, and the writer has noticed several instances lately where well-meaning people have been misled through information based on such erroneous sources.

While the mere absence of illiteracy in itself is no guarantee of good citizenship the writer is convinced that Catholics need not fear this, or any other criterion, provided that it is applied in a thoroughly scientific and impartial manner. At the same time we should not allow such damaging statements to go unchallenged lest our silence be misinterpreted.

HUGH GRAHAM,  
*College of St. Teresa,*  
*Winona, Minn.*

## THE PSYCHOLOGY OF MY CLASS

My pupils?

They are idols of hearts and of households;  
They are angels of God in disguise,

and, as I look around upon those "idols of hearts and of households," I realize the responsibility of helping each one towards the fulness of perfection. Each of them is endowed with gifts and powers especially her own; each of them good of her own kind, but oh! the variety the circles within circles to be explored! When first this theme was spoken of, I fancied I could sit and write quite freely about my pupils—their temperaments, their dispositions, their characters, their ideals and their inspirations. I fancied, too, that with little effort I might prove that it were an easy task to speak of the daily practice of dealing with them, collectively and individually; but, because of the variety in "God's angels in disguise," I feel that my theme will be superficial indeed. If it is true that my most intimate friends and nearest relations will live and die without having a true idea of what I really am, of the kind of life I suffer in my soul; and if I am, at times, stranger to myself, how can I expect to be satisfied with my effort at probing into the corners and crannies of the little hearts around me? The best I can do is to perceive clearly the ideal for which I am striving. The pupils given me to deal with are supposed to have within them all the capacity for excellence which is to be found in the best; consequently, I must educate them as though they have. My task is to train for life, for useful, honorable life—a life devoted to God's interests, to the welfare and happiness of others and to the perfection of self in view of the Life Eternal.

To attain this end, I have tried to study and to classify, as to temperament, the thirty-two pupils over whom I wish to exercise a beneficial influence.

There are many groupings which may serve my purpose:

I may classify temperaments as they have been grouped from ancient times with great unanimity.

- (a) Nervous
- (b) Sanguine

- (c) Bilious
- (d) Lymphatic or phlegmatic.

But since no temperament is perfect, I perceive that I must select as follows:

- (a) A group of sanguine-nervous.
- (b) A group of bilious-nervous.
- (c) A group of bilious-lymphatic.

I may classify them as I often like to do, as:

- (a) *The absorbers*, those who delight in receiving.
- (b) *The reflectors*, those who find happiness in giving.

I may again speak of them as:

- (a) *The optimists*, the hopeful; those who look for sunshine.
- (b) *The pessimists*, the despondent; those who live under clouds.

At times I may be drawn to look upon the groups as:

- (a) *Active*—those who cooperate spontaneously and cheerfully with any suggestion made in the classroom.
- (b) *Passive*—those who generally wait until they are either spurred or coaxed into action.

At other times I look at them through the dominant failing of each group, getting for result selections which may be styled:

- (a) The inconstant, frivolous minds.
- (b) The deceitful.
- (c) The undecided.
- (d) The idolent.
- (e) The irritable.
- (f) The sentimental, etc.

This grouping gives me an opportunity to suggest means for self-correction, giving the child a remedy for the defect which may have disastrous consequences in later life.

Human nature in the concrete is a curious collection of habits, moods and tendencies, and I, as a religious teacher, should ponder seriously over the words: "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment."

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF EACH GROUP

*Group I.*—The pupils of Group I form a temperamental section which I may designate as "sanguine-nervous"—optimists—doers—reflectors.

In general, they are attractive pupils; healthy-looking, wide-awake and emotional. The eyes are bright, vivid and expressive; the cheeks flush easily; the emotions of the mind are quickly seen in the face and the countenance is generally animated. This group is the first to respond to an appeal for a service asked. As I try to impart a truth, impress a fact or encourage skill in efforts at any art, penmanship, drawing, elocution, etc., I notice that the mind moves actively, that the feelings during literature periods are ardent and lively though the affections may be transient. The passions rise quickly and impetuous desires follow in swift succession. The members of this group have a strong propensity to mirth, so I must be on the alert to see the joke and judiciously allow the giggle to develop into a wholesome laugh.

Observation teaches me, too, that this group might easily be submerged in a life of gayety, so precautions must be taken to implant and develop moral and religious principles. Under the stress of a deep humiliation a few are apt to give way to excessive grief, with floods of tears which soon pass away. I have noticed, in the majority of them, a constant tendency to excess and exaggeration, intense expression and passion; resolutions suddenly taken after a morning talk on ethical training and immediately executed. They are proud of their school, their own classroom, the grounds, and take particular care in trying to keep all in good condition. Six of them are exceptionally honest and open-hearted while the others are slow in bestowing confidence; yet all delight in a world of ideal beings. Quite often I hear them lamenting over a lack of goodness or greatness and longing for places of ideal perfection. The greater number love music, drawing, elocution, a chance to appear in public, and fine sermons on Sunday. Nature study appeals to them all. Literature is their delight; history keeps them discussing about the merits and demerits of the day's hero or heroine; but the study of mathematics, which requires sustained activity, constant reflection, attention and reasoning, is too onerous for them, so the time allotted to it must be brief and oft-repeated and the work conducted with superabundant interest and energy.



With some there was unwilling and involuntary attention at the beginning of the year, but as the months crept on they cultivated a willing, voluntary effort. Nevertheless, the joy of discovery is not so keen as when studying geography, botany, physics, etc. When questioned in regard to their aversion to mathematics some say: "O Mother, it's too dry"; others will maintain that it is all right to get just enough for commercial purposes, but, "Who in after years," they say, "will be called upon to solve a problem in algebra or to prove a theorem in geometry?" It takes a good deal of persuasion to convince them that the study of mathematics is, in itself, an excellent help for their personal development. It is consoling to know that a mathematical mind is not the most perfect type of intellect; still it unquestionably marks the most complete power of abstraction, and I should like to succeed in giving all my pupils this wonderful power.

This group is my "noisy set" on the playground. There is no half-heartedness about either their organization of games or their plays of any kind. Quite often there is a "tiff" to be smoothed out, but the effort at reconciliation is an education in itself, so I do not worry.

During prayer hour this group will put forth a splendid initial effort—close eyes and answer fervently, but it takes little to distract them—the opening of a door, noise on the street, an object falling in the room, any trivial incident will suffice to cut off the current of their elevations to God.

They are dear, winning little souls, all of them, yet the oft-repeated, "O Mother, I forgot," provides a broad scope for my insistency on habit-formation.

In this group there is an exceptional child. L. has formidable eyes for one of the gentler sex. They are prominent and show a great deal of the white, and look as steadily, as unwinkingly at me as if they were steel balls soldered in her head; and when, while looking, she begins to recite her lessons in an indescribably dry, monotonous tone—a tone without vibration or inflection—I feel as if a graven image of some strange spirit were settled down among my pupils to test me. But it is all a figment of fancy, a matter of surface. L.'s grimness scarcely

goes deeper than the angel sweetness of a few of the beauties around her. She is a perfectly honest, conscientious girl who performs home duties under severe anguish. She has passed alone through protracted scenes of misery and suffering, exercising rigid self-denial; making sacrifices of time, health and temper for those who repay her only by ingratitude and an increasing display of tyranny; and now, her main—almost her sole fault—is that she is censorious. Still, it is not her heart as much as her temper that is wrong. She needs to be spoken to, not in sympathizing words—she would resent them—but with a sympathizing voice. When I knew the home conditions I felt that L. was rather to be admired for fortitude than blamed for moroseness. In daily communion she finds strength for the ordeal before her.

*Group II.*—My second group—the bilious-nervous, oftentimes pessimists, absorbers—is interesting.

They are dark, determined, resolute, apparently cold little ladies. Gifted with the ability for enlarged plans, patient endurance in execution, with prompt and sustained activity, they naturally form a set apart from the effervescent personalities of Group I. Their courage and resolution in meeting mental obstacles is a source of admiration to those around them. I have noticed that the majority in this group can cope with difficulties, both physical and mental, but there are difficulties of a serious nature on the moral side. Outbursts of passion do not pass pleasantly away: there is a tendency to sulkiness, moroseness, backbiting and a disposition to stir up mischief. These self-assertive types require careful treatment. Oftentimes a little storm is prevented by asking to have a favor done, by showing confidence, assigning some special work when it is possible, by having a little talk alone with the mischiefmaker in a natural but decided tone of voice, by keeping the reins firmly in my own hands and questioning the child about her misdemeanors rather than rebuking her for them. Generally speaking, I find that the pupils of this group have high aims; with some, the ambition to come out first is abnormal. They are athirst for attention, and a few often do silly things to attract notice. Should they fail in any recitation, lose ground in the

esteem of the teacher or get low percentages in examinations, there is a rich amount of dust-raising before they consent to say, "Bonum est mihi." They feel more at home on the heights and admire all that is high and true. This is noticeable during the periods of Religion, literature and history. They need more time to plan and calculate for success than the impulsive members of Group I. Great determination, self-reliance and invincible decision and persistence characterize their motives. A few who have much of the nervous with the bilious element are apt to look for grievances and to brood over them even when imaginary. They give way to melancholy for hours at a time and expect either parent, teacher or classmate to make the first step in the matter of reconciliation or in the settling of a difficulty. Flame and shadow seem to be the component parts of these girls' souls. They form friendships hastily and become most exacting in regard to the object of their affection; desiring the first place, yielding to jealousy when slighted, and taking offense when none was intended. When viewed from another angle these pupils are most loyal to friends, truthful, patient and methodical in all they plan. Their desks and tasks are always neat. A few exceptions to the rule may be traced to careless habits in early age, but they seem to be easily trained despite this lack in their up-bringing. Their games are not so satisfactory as those of Group I. They organize well and can prove their inventive skill, but they lack the generous, self-forgetfulness which makes for harmony and happiness in the recreations.

One child in the group called for particular attention all year. When she was crossed in a game, I watched the scowl and inferred that, in the home, the idol is never to be vexed, never to be opposed; parents probably avert provocation from her as assiduously as they would avert fire from a barrel of gunpowder. My duty became difficult in this case, but the work had to be done tactfully and the child prepared for the world's thrusts, otherwise there might be sad results in the future. Short class-talks on "Rights and Duties on the Playground," a few words of warning given privately, a word of approbation now and then after struggles against self and consideration of others, proved to be helpful in her case.

*Group III.*—The phlegmatic or lymphatic group—the absorbers—the passive temperament.

The chief characteristics of this section are, physically, a languid expression, and eyes that look tranquilly out upon all that surrounds them—eyes quite expressionless in some cases. The countenance is listless, and the child seems disinclined to muscular exertion or mental action. The mental signs which I have noted are varied. In some the mind is heavy, torpid. In those who are moderately phlegmatic, the temperament is especially favorable for well-directed, long-sustained and effective mental activity. The pupils in this group are generally self-balanced, stable, practical, judicious and often cheerful. There have been remarkable instances of equanimity, patience and calm self-reliance during the year. Though less attractive and less appreciated by visitors to the classroom, I, as teacher, know that they are more reliable, more thoughtful and more self-restrained. Lymphatic pupils are usually timid and shrinking in manner. They are apparently stubborn, so that I must be cautious in my treatment of them. Credit must be given to the good motives behind the seeming obstinacy which I deplore. A few have strong bilious-lymphatic temperaments, and these are what I inwardly term my "hard cases," especially when they have been subjected to wrong influences at home. In general, the members of this group have to fight hard—but do they always fight?—against laziness, late rising, strolling into class after time, lounging postures in class, wasting time when my eyes are not focused on them; dawdling over their work, procrastination in giving in compositions, indulging in day-dreams, untidiness, indifference to the troubles of their classmates, and thoughtlessness in regard to making home life more agreeable. Luckily there are very few with these characteristics. Though lamenting a lack of earnestness in their efforts to reform, I must say that, in looking back to the early September days, the comparison brings comfort with it. They prepare their tasks better, sit erect, and take more interest in study.

An almost hopeless case in this group is F. She is exceedingly calm; her smile is shrewd; she can say the driest, most cutting things to her classmates in the quietest of tones. Despite

her tranquillity, a somewhat heavy brow bespeaks temper and reminds me that the smoothest waters are not always the safest. Besides, she is too still, unmoved, phlegmatic, to be happy. Life will never have much joy in it for F., for she will kill it as fast as it is offered. By the time she is five-and-twenty she will wonder why people ever laugh and think all fools who are merry.

Poetry will not exist for F. either in literature or in life; its best effusions will sound to her mere rant or nonsense. Enthusiasm over things, events or people will be her aversion and contempt. F. has no youth; while she looks juvenile and blooming, she is almost middle-aged in mind. Her body is now sixteen but her soul seems to be thirty. I often wonder why, and I feel very sorry for her. The secret must be traced back a whole century, for the poor child has more than her share of dross, irritability and censoriousness. The one redeeming feature of her temperament is that she is truthful; painfully so, to be sure, but I am hopeful that the seed still slumbering in her soul may produce much in after years. Frequent confession and communion have done much for her. She tries to keep back angry words. She can bear reproof oftener without being impertinent and sulky. She condescends to take part in games during recess, etc. A deep, consoling thought is, that God loves that child infinitely more than I do, and He, in His own good time, will flood that soul with sunshine by leading it to understand the love that comes to it from Himself, first of all, and then from those whose affection is certainly not always met half-way just now.

As I re-read the study of my groups, I fear that I have emphasized the failings of each, whereas there is much to the credit of all in general. They have been admirably alert in their efforts to build up a character. They are on the lookout to render all sorts of services, to assist their classmates in a thousand little ways, with sincere and unobtrusive kindness; they are quick to anticipate and supply their needs and wishes; prompt to detect and remove accidental obstacles to their comfort; glad to promote the recognition of merit which otherwise might remain unnoticed by me; and they all seem intent upon making



each other as happy as possible. Very seldom do I hear rash suspicions, unfavorable constructions, offensive remarks, stinging replies, or selfish complaints. They have learned to understand each other, and I have tried to understand them, one and all.

To understand our pupils is one of Heaven's richest blessings and to be understood by them is perhaps love's sweetest and most satisfying gift. God's plan is one of reciprocity. We receive as we give, and approach true life and blend with the eternal plan of the universe only as we minister unto others.

Training in the classroom involves affection, unselfishness, impartiality, helpfulness, patience, tactfulness, protection and sympathetic interest. The pupils whom we understand will soon know it. Instinctively, with few exceptions, they open the door of their exclusive retirement and share with us their hopes, their confidences, their ideals and their aspirations. And above all else, yet with a conservatism and dignified reticence that almost approach silence and mystery, they allow us to look in upon the long-hidden sorrows and unseen crosses which have been carried, perhaps silently, through the few years of their slight experience in burden-bearing and give us the privilege of helping them to keep on prayerfully and cheerfully in their striving to live for God.

Life's school of experience teaches us how to understand and sympathize with our pupils. There is much of what is most trying to human nature—who can gainsay that?—but is there not genuine compensation in being understood in the little things of daily school-life—in the everyday talks in the classroom, in the disciplinary glances, expressions, acts, suggestions, rebukes and corrections?

To be understood means vastly more than the mere personal attachments and loyalty of our pupils. We earn this rare blessing through our attainments in the art of understanding others. It is the divine compensation or return for so sympathetically and unselfishly entering into the interests and progress of our pupils. In turn they see in the teacher the harmony of God's rounded plan of divine love and they soon recognize the significance of the royal virtue eulogized by the Great Apostle:



"Charity is patient and obliging; it is neither envious nor morose, neither arrogant nor ostentatious: it is not selfish or irascible, or resentful: it takes no pleasure in what is evil, but dwells with joy on what is good: it is ever ready to excuse, to believe, to hope and to suffer."

SISTER SAINT JOSEPH OF THE CHERUBIM, C.N.D.

## THE PRESENT STATUS OF TRANSFER OF TRAINING

During the past two or three decades the question of the transfer of training, that is, whether training gained in one sphere of thought or activity can be transferred to other spheres of thought and activity, has frequently occasioned an educational ferment. As a result, there have been series of discussions which have led to a better understanding of transfer as held by its advocates at the present time.

It goes without saying that the problem of the reciprocal influence between various mental activities is one of the most important in the educational thought of today. That it is so, Dr. Ernest C. Moore, State Normal School, Los Angeles, emphatically asserts in his recent work. Quoting Professor Whipple to the effect that "the problem of mental discipline is acknowledged to be the central problem of educational psychology," Dr. Moore continues: "It is the central problem of educational philosophy as well, and the attitude which we take upon this problem determines, as nothing else does, what we put into the courses of study and how we teach that which we attempt to teach."<sup>1</sup>

There have been, however, some educational modernists who took particular pains to throw discredit on the supposition that school subjects have a disciplinary value. From their point of view mental discipline is "a mere myth," "an exploded theory," "an offshoot of formal discipline and the now-abandoned faculty psychology," fit only to occupy a place among other academic psychological curios in a well-ordered museum. But, mental discipline thus brusquely ruled out of court is returning stripped of the obloquy that was heaped upon it by its foes, to claim an ever-increasing number of adherents from the ranks of careful students of educational problems. They now tell us that to dismiss the question of transfer of training with a few stock arguments about the "faculty psychology," "localization of function," and formal discipline, is to give evidence of a lack of intensive study of the abundant literature on this topic, and also of a

---

<sup>1</sup> E. C. Moore, *What the War Teaches about Education*, N. Y., 1919, p. 76.

misunderstanding of the terms used by those who believe in the disciplinary value of school subjects.

Some educators, it is said, have given as one of their principal objections to the acceptance of transfer of training that it is an offshoot of the doctrine of formal discipline. This doctrine is commonly understood to be the idea that any subject, especially if it appear disagreeable to the pupil and have no definite relationship either to his past experience or present needs, will mean most for his education. It is referred to by Horne as the doctrine which "asserts that mental power developed in one subject is usable in any other."<sup>2</sup> And Ruediger says: "The advocates of this doctrine maintain that the chief, if not the sole, value of the educative process consists in the formal development of the mind's powers. It makes little difference what is studied so long as it is studied right. The benefit it receives comes from the process of acquisition rather than from the content acquired."<sup>3</sup>

Maintaining, therefore, that the words "formal discipline" obviously suggest forms of mind as distinguished from material or content, the opponents of the doctrine claim that it rests solidly on the conception of faculties. These being assumed, the essential task consists in training these forms or capacities for effective use in any direction. Hence, the opponents of formal discipline have rejected the "faculty psychology" and have attributed an extreme position "that they have never really succeeded in finding . . . actually represented by any one of the advocates of the doctrine."<sup>4</sup>

"Faculty psychology," it appears, is a thorn in the side of several writers, who do not fail to show their animus when treating of mental discipline. They find relief in taking the usual fling at Scholasticism as the origin of the pedagogical ills to which education has fallen heir. Thus Professor Heck, University of Virginia, believes that the doctrine of formal discipline with its concomitant faculty psychology is a survival of the days of Scholasticism, "the halcyon period of formal studies." He writes: "The doctrine was at the basis of the

<sup>2</sup> Horne, *Psychological Principles of Education*, N. Y., 1918, p. 66.

<sup>3</sup> Ruediger, *The Principles of Education*, N. Y., 1910, p. 91.

<sup>4</sup> Judd, *Psychology of High School Subjects*, N. Y., 1915, p. 395.

ascetic discipline of the medieval monastics who sought a complete development of the soul at the expense of bodily desires. It dominated the ideals and methods of scholastic education."<sup>8</sup> And Boyd H. Bode thus expresses his opinion: "The doctrine of formal discipline is supported by the faculty psychology inherited from the age of scholasticism."<sup>9</sup> Monroe,<sup>7</sup> likewise refers to the scholastic period as one of considerable formalism, when the mind was looked upon as a "bundle of faculties" and capable of being developed by exercising these powers upon appropriate tasks whose only value consisted in the difficulties they offered.

Professor Heck's attitude, however, is sharply criticized by Colvin,<sup>6</sup> who considers the arguments of the former to be valueless since they are based not on experimental evidence but on certain theoretical assumptions. Also, the claim of Heck that cerebral localization makes transfer of training impossible is shown by Dr. Freeman<sup>5</sup> to lack foundation. Freeman's statements are substantiated by Villiger, who gives a detailed description of the work accomplished in the study of the cerebral cortical centers. He tells us that although these centers as yet are not accurately delimited, we must assume "that all the higher association processes (intellectual centers proper) are connected with the collective activity of many, perhaps of all, the cortical regions."<sup>10</sup>

In so far as scholastic philosophy is concerned, St. Thomas certainly did not teach that the faculties are water-tight compartments of the mind, as several authors would lead us to believe. On the other hand, he makes it clear that a faculty is a "potential part" of the soul, not a "quantitative part"; that it is an indication of the kind of work done by the mind without, however, implying a division of the mind. St. Thomas "is at least free from the absurdities with which modern psychologists so frequently charge the faculty psychology. His expressions, taken apart from their context and translated without a suffi-

<sup>8</sup> Heck, *Mental Discipline and Educational Values*, N. Y., 1911, p. 12.

<sup>9</sup> Bode, *Fundamentals of Education*, N. Y., 1921.

<sup>7</sup> Monroe, *Textbook in the History of Education*, N. Y., 1914, p. 567.

<sup>6</sup> Colvin, *The Learning Process*, N. Y., 1911, p. 235.

<sup>5</sup> Freeman, *How Children Learn*, N. Y., 1917, p. 268.

<sup>10</sup> Villiger, *Brain and Spinal Cord*, Phila., 1918, p. 129.

cient acquaintance with the scholastic terminology, might easily be given a wrong interpretation."<sup>11</sup>

Moreover, why is it that modern texts eschew the term "faculty" and still constantly make use of synonyms for it? We find in the works of writers on functional psychology such expressions as powers, capacities, aptitudes, functions, factors, abilities, theory of connection forming, bonds, psychical dispositions, etc., but no mention of faculty. "They are afraid," remarks Father Donnelly, S.J., "of 'faculty psychology,' whatever may be meant by the term. Someone has evidently built up a false notion of what is understood by faculties in philosophy and now the term is taboo."<sup>12</sup>

In this discussion of the transfer of training, however, we must bear in mind that it should not be confused with the doctrine of formal discipline as commonly interpreted. The distinction is of the utmost importance, for transferability involves no presumption of an antithesis of form and content.

Those, therefore, who have been making investigations in this field have not been trying to find out whether the powers of the mind can be trained. To look for an answer to that question they would consider an absurdity. But they have endeavored to determine to what extent improvement in such mental capacities as are involved in school studies will modify proficiency in any other activities or interests in life. The investigators may be grouped into two schools. First, those who claim that the effect of training is "specific" and oppose the view that transfer can be made possible through generalized experience; secondly, those who believe that the effect of practice can be "generalized." Numerically, the latter are the stronger. Through the medium of the October, 1917, to June, 1918, issues of *School and Society*, an interesting argument was carried on between the protagonists of each school. Dr. E. C. Moore, Los Angeles, represented those who favor specific training, and Dr. C. N. Moore, University of Cincinnati, defended the principles of the generalizers. The weight of evidence seemed to be in favor of those who believe in generalized experience.

<sup>11</sup> Dubray, *Faculties of the Soul*, Cath. Ency., Vol. V, p. 749.

<sup>12</sup> Donnelly, *The Philosophic Basis of Mental Tests*, C. E. A. Bulletin, 1923, p. 167.

Up to twenty-five years ago there was scarcely any empirical study of the problem of transfer, and prior to 1909 only three studies concerning mental discipline were published. The experimental investigations, also, lie practically within the past twenty years. Three types of experiments have been made. They are: (a) Those dealing with memory abilities, (b) those with sensory-perceptual data or motor-habit formation, and (c) those with specific school activities. Very few have dealt with the last, which is the most important.

Probably the most thorough and extensive study of the experimental work in mental discipline up to 1915 was made by Dr. H. O. Rugg, Teachers College, Columbia University. He tabulates thirty experiments. Of the thirty investigations there are only four in which there is declared to be no evidence of transfer. Three of these, however, have been partly repeated or "checked-up" statistically and clearly show transfer of training. According to Rugg, "transfer is an accepted experimental fact."<sup>13</sup>

Recently, the compilation made by Rugg was added to by Miss Vivia Blair, Horace Mann School, New York, who has brought the listed experimental work up to 1920. Miss Blair's article, "The Present Status of 'Disciplinary Values' in Education," besides recording the latest experiments in the field of mental discipline, gives a summary of the present psychological opinions on the problem of transfer. "As the question now stands, as to transfer of training, the psychologists quoted here almost unanimously agree that transfer does exist," says Miss Blair. And "the amount of transfer in any case, where transfer is admitted at all, is very largely dependent upon methods of teaching. This is probably the strongest note struck by the psychologists in their comments."<sup>14</sup>

There can be no doubt that transferability is more dependent on the aptitude of the teacher for the correct organization and teaching of a subject than upon the subject itself. That is, transference of training is not a matter of studies as such, but of the right pedagogical use or employment. An efficient teacher,

<sup>13</sup> Rugg, *The Experimental Determination of Mental Discipline in School Studies*, Baltimore, 1915, p. 18.

<sup>14</sup> Blair, *Report of the Math. Assoc. of America*, N. H., 1923, p. 89.



therefore, does not use stereotyped methods of procedure which make studies "a closed domain of experience." On the other hand, he vitalizes his teaching and stimulates his pupils to go out in further investigation of the world, thereby contributing to the broadening of their general experience. Thus, "formalism" in the true sense is avoided; for "A subject which gets itself so organized that it rotates around its own center, immediately becomes formal."<sup>15</sup>

If what we teach is to have any transfer value, which is almost equivalent to saying if it is to have any practical value for the average student, the transfer should be half made in school. To make it complete is to defeat the purpose of the school, which is to present experience in concentrated form, ready to be expanded and applied in later life. Not to make any transfer at all in school results in blinding the pupils to the possibility of it, and in closing their minds to the idea that theories and knowledge learned in school have any bearing on every-day life. Pupils, therefore, must learn many things which cannot be based upon their present experience; but a basis in their present experience should by all means be sought whenever possible. A student who has analyzed a bit of his own thinking will begin to see what logic is all about; one who has studied the growth of plants in his own garden or in the woods is ready to understand botany, etc. In recent years the project method has found favor because its aim is this relating of school activities to life.

But, if the teacher is to relate the knowledge which he imparts to his pupils, it must be related to life in his own mind. A teacher of literature must have "a feeling for literature" if he is to make it a force in the thought and life of his pupils. The teacher of physics who would make his pupils more intelligent and efficient in every-day affairs must himself be awake to the countless illustrations and advances everywhere encountered in the rapid development of that science. And the teacher of religion must not only possess knowledge, but he must be a man of God, reverent and high-minded, if he is to bring to full fruition in the heart of the child those virtues that will form a strong character, awaken conscience to the word and love of God, and help him to lead a truly supernatural life. Transfer

<sup>15</sup> Judd, *op. cit.*, p. 421.

to after life will be accomplished, if the teacher makes religious practices a matter of "conscious ideation." This can be done not only in the regular teaching of the catechism lesson, but also in the giving of short, interesting, daily talks, or reflections suitable to the age of the children. If daily reflections are made, similar to those outlined in Dr. Cooper's refreshing and instructive "Play Fair,"<sup>16</sup> the spirit of prayer and religious ideals will be kept active in the breasts of the pupils. Then the pupils, being rightly trained to form ideals, should leave our classrooms to go out into life's great world with the complete realization that they will find true happiness in leading lives in harmony with those "conscious ideals" of virtue and religion inculcated during the period of school life.

Again, there is no doubt that one who is acquainted with systems of knowledge will have broad points of view, a judicial, open-minded attitude towards all questions, a knowledge of how to look for facts and of what kind of principles to apply in dealing intelligently with them. Therefore the teacher should, as far as possible, when treating of problems that arise during the various lessons, call attention to numerous other problems among the various activities and processes which are going on outside of the schoolroom. This should be done, however, only within the scope of the pupils' knowledge and only in those cases or situations to which a similar method is applicable. In this way a background of fundamental attitudes of orientation will be built up. The aim in making this emphasis is to inspire the young learners with such widely applicable ideals of methodical procedure, of correct thinking, and of accurate organized information, as may be carried over into all their other work.

When the teacher fails to form these generalized habits and to build up concepts of method, many opportunities for transfer of training are lost. How many students are able to use the logical methods of geometry outside of that subject any the better because they had studied it? Few, it is said. Why? Because the teacher generally spends his time forcing new theorems on the class instead of spending time in helping his pupils to generalize. The pupils are not taught to apply to anything outside of the subject the principles of reasoning which

<sup>16</sup> Cooper, *Play Fair*, Washington, 1923.

geometry is supposed to inculcate. Would not a great deal be gained if the teacher could "work up" the attitude of Lincoln, who, after he had studied two or three theorems, sat back and said, "Now I see what it means to prove a thing." Then the teacher should realize that the arithmetical problems a child will solve in life are different from those he solves in school; and the political questions a student meets in the world are not exactly the same as those he studies in the class in civics. But they are recognizably similar, otherwise he could not possibly use his school learning to react to them. If geography be taught so that there is a vital connection between school and life outside of school; history, so that it supplies the child with answers to his problems and raises more problems still; languages, so that they can be used; sciences, so that the world about us is either intelligible or intelligently unintelligible, then a wholesome transfer will result. This is in accord with our understanding of transfer of training as it is held today, namely, that the very essence of transferability lies in training that has elements of method that belong whole or in part to many life situations.

BROTHER ALPHONSUS, F.S.C.

## THE STERLING-REED BILL—A CRITICISM

Few measures introduced in the Sixty-Eighth Congress have had so much publicity or have aroused such widespread public interest as the Sterling-Reed Bill. Familiarly known as the "Education Bill," this measure has been for months a storm center about which converged the opposing educational forces of the country. The nationalist school of thought, which views education as the proper function of the Government and looks to the Government for its moral and financial support in the development of American education, has carried on a nationwide propaganda in favor of the Sterling-Reed Bill. Led by the National Education Association, which has given the bill its unqualified support, a great number of state superintendents, college presidents, school teachers, the members of several women's and fraternal organizations have expressed themselves as favoring legislation which would create a Department of Education with a secretary in the President's cabinet. On the other hand, numerous educators, educational bodies and business organizations have gone on record as opposed to the Sterling-Reed Bill. These latter see in the bill an attempt to nationalize the school through the granting of large subsidies to the states. They also fear the educational consequences which would follow necessarily upon the taking over and standardizing of the schools by the Central Government. The differences which divide these two groups are fundamental, involving widely diverse conceptions of the place of education in a democracy. The proponents of the bill quite frankly admit that they favor the national school. The opponents, on the other hand, believe that centralization has already gone too far in this country and are adverse to any measure which would bestow upon Washington more power than it now possesses for the governing and regulating of education in the United States.

The Sterling-Reed Bill, therefore, is a measure of critical interest for every citizen. It marks a departure from our traditional method of handling problems of education in this country. Do we wish to adopt this new policy with all its possible implications, or shall we stand for the school as an object

of local interest and control? The consequences of a decision are so manifestly grave, no matter what policy we may favor, that no one should take a position on this question until after he has studied the problem from every angle and feels himself qualified, through an intimate acquaintance with all the factors and arguments, to pass an intelligible and satisfactory judgment on the issues involved.

*The Provisions of the Sterling-Reed Bill.*—The principal features of the Sterling-Reed Bill are the following: In the first place, it provides for:

1. A Department of Education with a secretary in the President's cabinet at an annual salary of \$12,000. To this department would be transferred the Federal Bureau of Education and all other governmental educational activities as determined by Congress. The functions of the Department of Education would be to conduct surveys and investigations, and to make reports on the conditions of public education in the United States. Five hundred thousand dollars is appropriated for this administrative work.

2. An appropriation of \$100,000,000 to be awarded annually to the several states on the condition that the states appropriate a similar amount for the following purposes:

- (a) \$7,500,000 for the removal of illiteracy.
- (b) \$7,500,000 for Americanization of the foreign born.
- (c) \$50,000,000 for the equalization of educational opportunity to those states which qualify. To qualify, a state must accept the following standards: a school year of twenty-four weeks; a compulsory school attendance law for all children between the ages of seven and fourteen; English as the basis of instruction in all subjects in all schools, public and private.
- (d) \$20,000,000 for the promotion of physical and health education.
- (e) \$50,000,000 for teacher-training.

3. No state is obliged to accept the provisions of the Sterling-Reed Bill, but if a state shall accept, the rules laid down in the bill for the allotment and use of the money appropriated must be complied with. The funds appropriated, however, are to be spent according to state laws.

*History of the Sterling-Reed Bill.*—The Sterling-Reed Bill was introduced into the Sixty-fifth Congress by former Senator

Smith, of Georgia, hence its name, the Smith Bill. It was reintroduced into the Sixty-sixth Congress, and known as the Smith-Towner Bill. Failing of passage, it was introduced into the Sixty-seventh Congress by Representative Towner and Senator Sterling, and known as the Towner-Sterling Bill. In the Sixty-eighth Congress it was again introduced by Senator Sterling in the Senate and Representative Reed in the House, and is called the Sterling-Reed Bill. Both the Senate and House Committees on Education of the Sixty-eighth Congress have held hearings on this measure.

*Objections to the Sterling-Reed Bill.*—The nation-wide propaganda in favor of this measure has closed the eyes of many people to important and serious objections which are discoverable after a thorough examination. In proposing these objections it should be remembered that they are not leveled against public education as such. All right-thinking men favor every effort by the Federal Government, consistent with the principles laid down in the Constitution, tending to the development of education in the United States. No one is adverse to legislation which will assist in the removal of illiteracy, which will help in the Americanization of the foreign born, which will promote physical education and the better training of teachers, or which will equalize educational opportunity to the extent that every American child shall profit by education. These purposes are all good. The method of attaining them, as outlined in the Sterling-Reed Bill, is bad. For constitutional, economic, and educational reasons, we feel justified in opposing a measure which, if enacted into law, would undoubtedly do more injury than good to the schools of the United States.

*Federal Control of Education.*—The Federal Government is one of enumerated and strictly limited powers bestowed upon it by the Constitution. But control of education is not one of these powers. On the contrary, the control of education is vested by the Constitution in the several states. This must be accepted as a primary principle in every discussion of the relations of the Federal Government to education. No measure, therefore, which does away with or subtracts from, in an appreciable degree, the control of the several states over their own educational systems can be regarded as constitutional.



The Government can, and must, promote the general welfare, but to rely upon the general welfare clause of the Constitution to justify federal control of the school is to do away with a doctrine which is vital to all constitutional law, namely, that the powers of the Government are strictly limited, or that it can exercise powers other than those expressly named in the Constitution.

In regard to education, the practice of the Government has always been consistent. While it has aided education in the states by grants of one kind or another, it has never assumed control of the schools. Education has always been viewed, up to recent years, as a function of the states, not of the National Government. In 1914, however, the Smith-Lever Act was passed, and thus was begun a policy of federal money grants to education with consequent control. The Smith-Lever Act inaugurated an entirely new attitude on the part of the Federal Government towards education. This principle of control was reinforced by the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, by virtue of which the general government, under the guise of cooperating with the states, assumed a directive power over vocational education in secondary schools. The Industrial Rehabilitation Act of 1920 is an extension of federal control to another and important portion of the field of educational activity.

The courts have never decided that the policy of federal cooperation with the states on a "fifty-fifty" basis is unconstitutional for the simple reason that no one has taken it upon himself to question the constitutionality of this legislation. This omission, however, does not confer upon these acts of Congress, nor on the proposed legislation embodied in the Sterling-Reed Bill, the quality of constitutionality. The great majority of constitutional authorities are agreed that educational bills containing federal control features are unconstitutional. But even granting that the bills in question are not explicitly against the Constitution, all must agree that they are not written according to the spirit of the Constitution.

The defenders of the Sterling-Reed Bill cite in answer to these objections the proviso of the bill which states that "this act shall not be construed to imply federal control of education within the states." Such a proviso is manifestly futile. If the

National Government appropriates \$100,000,000 annually to the encouragement of education in the states, can anyone imagine the Government not insisting on controlling the manner in which such vast sums shall be spent? To suppose otherwise would be to convict Congress of stupidity and despoliation of the elementary principles of business prudence and common sense.

If Congress votes funds to the states for educational purposes, every principle of good sense demands that it likewise formulate the policies which must be followed by the states in order to obtain these appropriations. And if these appropriations are constitutional, then Congress can obtain by indirection what is expressly forbidden by the Constitution, control of education in the states. Both the Smith-Lever and Smith-Hughes Acts are concrete examples of what the federal subsidizing of education will inevitably lead to. For, as every educator knows, the power of the National Government, in the fields of agricultural and vocational education, is practically unlimited. Today the National Government virtually controls agricultural and vocational education.

*The Centralization of Education.*—Granting for the sake of argument the constitutionality of the Sterling-Reed Bill, one may question seriously whether the method of appropriating money from the Federal Treasury on a "fifty-fifty" basis is a desirable way of promoting education throughout the nation. Education is a national problem, indeed, but that fact does not necessitate legislation of a national character under the guise of encouraging education. Every good law passed locally benefits the whole country. Because the nation benefits by good laws is no justification for the Central Government taking over the work of local communities.

Education is, and always has been, in a peculiar manner a matter of local control and encouragement. Local interest in education can be depended upon to do all that is necessary for the development of the school. And the local community should only appeal to Washington for aid if it is willing, as the price of this assistance, to give up a large portion of control over its own schools. The natural and inevitable results of national "encouragement" of education would be national standards for schools, national courses of study, national educational methods

—in a word, a national conformity which would paralyze local initiative and impose upon every community a set of rigid standards wholly unadaptable to local needs and conditions.

There are many other interests in our country which possess national significance besides education. As it is not the function of the Government to "encourage" these, but to govern, so likewise it need not encourage education nationally in the sense of appropriating huge subsidies for its benefit. Moreover, it is a pure assumption that if we possessed a Federal Department of Education we would have good schools. What we would have is an army of bureaucrats, thousands of inspectors, countless other jobs, political interference in education, and an annual demand to increase the appropriation from \$100,000,000 to an indefinite amount.

What education needs in the United States is not federal control, but better state control. Because some states have been negligent in providing adequately for their schools is no reason for asking the Central Government to take them over. The backward states may be stimulated to greater effort by federal grants. But one may well question whether, in the last analysis, it would not be better for these states to work out their own problems rather than depend upon the Central Government, which, if it appropriates money, would demand in return that the states accept the system of more or less inflexible educational standards which it must set up. Many of the European countries subsidize education, it is true, but they control education as well. France and Prussia are concrete examples of what a state-subsidized and state-controlled system of schools leads to. Is it in the best interests of American education to renounce our traditional policy of local control in order to walk in the way of the Prussian system?

The process of centralization has assumed proportions in the United States which threaten the stability of our constitutional system. This movement must be checked in the best interests of both the states and the Government. National unity does not demand anything like a national system of schools. We need indeed a common language, common interests and ideals, a consciousness of a common citizenship. We do not need national schools, national church laws, national health laws, nor national

standards in any other field. The United States is too large, too diversified in its physical, moral and economic make-up to expect or even to desire national unity except along the lines laid down in the Constitution. Taxation, the treaty power, the postal service, are national interests, but education can be classed as a "national interest" only by bidding defiance to the Constitution itself. The social, moral and educational interests of the people of the several states should be under their supreme control. For the Federal Government to assume such control would add little or nothing to our national unity, and eventually would end in destroying the most fundamental right of the democratic state—the right to govern ourselves as we see fit.

*Centralized Education Destroys Local Initiative.*—The essence of centralization is to take away from the local community its power of initiative and to weaken its responsibility for what goes on. If education were federally controlled, the central bureau naturally would assume charge of the schools all over the country. Being far removed from the local situation and generally unacquainted with local needs, the federal bureau must systematize its work by the issuance of general rules and methods of action. These national standards are as often as not mere bureaucratic ukases and spell decay when applied to situations where their recommendations cannot be carried out.

Education is a matter of experimentation. Only by experimentation can we learn what to accept and what to reject. Moreover, these local experiments are undertaken by men who know and are vitally interested in local needs. No Federal Department of Education can hope to know, or will ever feel itself responsible for the meeting of, all local needs. And in no field of human endeavor is the duty of local responsibility more pressing and more productive of good results than in that of education.

An educational bureaucracy, situated thousands of miles away, cannot but have a depressing and deterring effect on local initiative. The success of American government has been due in the past almost wholly to the fact that the states have legislated mainly for themselves and have administered their own laws no less wisely. The people, because of their continual contacts with the state government, have been able to keep a watchful

eye on local legislation and have registered in no uncertain terms their approval or disapproval. If education, however, were controlled from Washington, this intimacy between the people and its government would be broken down and education would suffer in the process.

Moreover, it is false to assume that the states have done all they can in the interests of education, as it is false to state that the present system of education under local control has broken down. Anyone acquainted with the development of education since 1870 knows full well that in attendance, improvement of curriculum, physical and health education, buildings, equipment, teacher training and salaries, as well as in funds available from taxation for school purposes, our schools have shown remarkable improvement. The fact that some states have been derelict or that certain kinds of education have not received the attention they deserve is a matter of grave concern. Such a condition, lamentable as it is, does not spell federal aid and control. On the contrary, the backward states should be called upon to do more for education. No state has helped education to the limit of its ability. There is enough wealth, even in the poorest state, to have a good system of education. The "poverty" argument is a sophism, as everyone conversant with the question knows.

Finally, the greatest menace of a centralized control of education to a democracy lies in the fact that under such a government a well-organized minority could obtain control of the whole American system of education. When this control had been obtained by a minority group, it would be next to impossible to dislodge them. It is scarcely necessary to point out the possibilities for harm inherent in such an eventuality.

*The Economic Fallacies of the Sterling-Reed Bill.*—The principle of appropriating federal money to the states on a "fifty-fifty" basis is economically unsound, as it is wrong in principle. It is wrong in principle because it bestows upon Congress the power to determine what state appropriations shall be made, as well as how both these and federal appropriations must be spent. The state may imagine that it is getting something for nothing when it receives federal money, but it will soon realize that the acceptance of federal aid carries along with it a large



measure of federal interference in the affairs of each commonwealth. Only on the theory that the Central Government shall control a given function of a state can federal aid be justified.

Federal aid, on its face, gives a state something for nothing. When the policy of federal aid is analyzed, however, one discovers that it does nothing of the sort. In order to receive its share of the federal appropriation, the state legislature must appropriate an equal amount, plus its share of the expense of distribution and of the administrative expense of the Federal Department of Education. Alabama, for example, in order to receive \$2,571,370, must appropriate a like \$2,571,370, and between \$350,000 and \$410,000 for the expense of distribution, and \$1,050 to \$1,230 for the expense of the Department of Education. In return, there is constant interference on the part of the Federal Government in the educational system of Alabama. With a somewhat larger appropriation, Alabama, unassisted, would be able to establish a first-class system of its own and would not have to be plagued by federal inspectors and standards. Again, other states would receive much less than they actually send to the Federal Treasury. And those states which would receive more could easily obtain enough money by state taxation if they were only willing to reorganize their antiquated methods of raising revenue, or would increase their assessment on real property at the rate of \$1.00 on a thousand, or would secure money by income or inheritance taxes, methods unknown to these backward states. It is difficult to see how federal aid can be justified under such conditions. The principal effect of federal subsidies appears to be to penalize the progressive states or to keep the poorer states in their self-imposed poverty.

Furthermore, no rule of apportioning federal grants can be constructed which will not issue in giving states money which they do not need. If a state cannot maintain its own system of schools, the Government should aid, but in this case it is only just that the Federal Government, not the state, should control the schools.

The rules of apportionment set out in the Sterling-Reed Bill would not accomplish the purposes of the bill. Fifty million dollars, for example, is apportioned to equalize educational op-



portunity. Twenty-five million dollars of this sum is distributed according to the number of children in a community. Therefore, states like New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Illinois and Indiana, all able to care for their own schools and not in need of federal aid, would receive the major part of the apportionment. What then becomes of equalization? Again, \$25,000,000 is set aside for teachers' salaries to be apportioned according to the number of teachers. This provision means that the state which has the most teachers receives the most federal money. Again, what becomes of equalization? Moreover, each child would receive only eighty cents and each teacher \$38.40 from the federal funds appropriated. Can anyone contend that such insignificant amounts will serve to equalize educational opportunity in the states?

The grant of \$15,000,000 for teacher training is apportioned according to the number of teachers. This, again, helps the populous and rich states. The same may be said of the \$20,000,000 appropriated for physical education. From this short analysis, it seems clear that the basis of apportionment throughout the Sterling-Reed Bill is both unscientific and uneconomic. And it is a question whether any general rule of apportionment can be devised which would not be open to grave objections.

*Increase of Taxation.*—No question before the American people is more serious than that of taxation. Taxes have increased at a tremendous rate during the last decade, and especially federal taxes. Serious students of the problem are unanimous in demanding a reduction of the heavy financial burdens which the people are called upon to bear. In spite of the present economic situation, Congress is preparing to saddle the country with huge additional debts. No one should object to money being spent for education, if the money is needed and, when acquired, wisely spent. But the cost of public education has grown enormously in the last three decades, and many educators question whether the results achieved justify the increased expenditures. Whatever one may think of the problem of the rising cost of education, it is certain that federal aid can only be accepted if we are willing to increase very materially the amount of taxes already levied by the states for education. For it must never be forgotten that the Federal Treasury obtains

its funds from the people, and, when the Government gives away money, it is giving away the money of the people. This is a fact which practically all the proponents of federal aid to education refuse to take into consideration.

The Sterling-Reed Bill would very materially increase taxation, and with no certain educational results. It has been estimated that if the Sterling-Reed Bill became law the income tax of every family in the United States would be increased \$5 annually. The appropriation of \$100,000,000 by the Government, to which must be added an appropriation of \$100,000,000 by the states, means, at a 4 per cent rate of interest, the addition of \$5,000,000,000 to the national debt. Americans would be willing to pay this sum if the money went into education. Anyone acquainted with the appropriation features of the Sterling-Reed Bill, however, knows that only a negligible amount of the \$100,000,000 given by the Government would go to the actual development of education. It has been pointed out again and again that it would be much more beneficial and economical for each state to tax itself a sufficient sum of money to meet its own educational demands than to accept grants from the Federal Treasury with the attendant evils of control, waste of funds, high expense for distribution, etc.

*Education and Politics.*—One of the most serious objections to the Sterling-Reed Bill is that, if a Department of Education were established, education would thereupon become a political issue. There is not need to emphasize the disastrous effects of injecting politics, especially national politics, into the schools. A Secretary of Education would be a political officer pure and simple, and the Department of Education would be honeycombed with politician-educators.

It is contended that we should have a Secretary of Education in the President's cabinet in order to "recognize" the national significance of education, just as we have a Department of Labor and a Department of Agriculture. This argument, in the first place, assumes that the Department of Education would be a federal department in all ways similar to the Departments of Labor and Agriculture. Such, however, is not the case. These latter departments are merely centers for the distribution of information. Their one purpose is to investigate

agricultural and labor conditions and report on the same. They do not control agriculture nor labor. Neither do they possess huge subsidies which they may dole out to these interests. At the present time, the Bureau of Education is doing for education, through its service of information and research, precisely what the Departments of Labor and Agriculture are accomplishing for their interests. This service, it must be admitted, is very inadequate, due to the small annual appropriation for the work of the Bureau of Education. Added appropriations, however, would place the bureau in a position to do all that is necessary for the stimulation and development of education in the United States.

In the second place, education receives greater recognition in the United States than in any country of Europe. This is an unquestionable fact. The states spend \$1,500,000,000 for education annually, and every state has its own Secretary of Education, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The only factor the possession of a Federal Secretary of Education would add to our present situation is the element of centralized control.

Finally, that a secretary in the President's cabinet would provide "educational leadership" is fanciful, to say the least. Leadership is a matter of personality, not of official position. One thing a secretary in the President's cabinet would do—he would throw education into the seething caldron of national politics with harmful consequences both to education and to politics. Forward-looking educators have fought for half a century to keep education out of politics. Shall we now reverse our position simply to obtain the empty honor of a place in the President's cabinet?

*Conclusion.*—The original education bill was presented to meet an emergency in education due to war conditions. Many school systems were faced with a serious financial situation; teachers were scarce; the extent to which illiteracy, as revealed by the examination of army recruits, had hampered the efficient working of the army, was present in the public mind. A large number of educators were convinced that without the assistance of the Federal Government many of the states would not be able to meet the crisis. The war-time emergency has passed. The supply of teachers is almost normal, and the financial sup-

port of the schools is adequate in practically every state of the Union. In these circumstances it would be foolhardy to change the whole direction of American education away from the features of local initiative and control, which have always characterized it, into channels in which the Government must assume a monopoly of the educational resources of the nation. From the point of view, therefore, of our educational history, the Sterling-Reed Bill can scarcely be approved by educators. Moreover, it represents a tendency in governmental matters altogether foreign to our ordinary method of dealing with the schools.

An increasing number of statesmen, business men, and teachers, conscious of the serious objections to any measure which would federalize the school, have openly voiced their opposition to the Sterling-Reed Bill. Whatever may have been the need for such legislation in 1918 and in the year following, there is no such need now. American education needs guidance, stimulation, development. It does not need federal control. To pass the Sterling-Reed Bill would be to put the American school on the level of the state schools of Prussia or France, and to destroy at the same time that essential characteristic of our schools which has made them American and respected the world over.

JAMES H. RYAN.

## SOME PROBLEMS OF THE CATHOLIC COLLEGE

### IV. TEACHING SCHEDULES

At the last meeting of the Catholic Educational Association, held at Cleveland, Ohio, June 25-28, 1923, the Department of Colleges and Secondary Schools by unanimous vote adopted the principles and standards for accrediting colleges formulated by the American Council on Education, thus putting the association on record as desirous of conforming in all the details of standardization with the other recognized accrediting agencies throughout the country.<sup>1</sup> It may be said in passing that this action of the association brought about no radical changes in its existing standards. It did, however, put an end to the necessity of making yearly revisions in the wording of this or that particular standard and gave to Catholic colleges a definite statement of the requirements they are expected to meet, with the assurance that in complying with the same they will be in a position to demand recognition not only from the Catholic Educational Association, but also from the secular standardizing agencies.

Among the standards thus adopted one, No. 3, covers requirements pertaining to the faculty of the college that were formerly distributed under three separate headings, viz., Number of Teachers and of Departments, Training of Faculty, and Teaching Schedules. As we have treated the first two of these topics in previous articles,<sup>2</sup> our present discussion will be limited to the consideration of the third, which reads: "Teaching schedules exceeding 16 hours per week per instructor . . . should be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency."<sup>3</sup>

Strange as it may seem, none of the regulations proposed or maintained by the various standardizing agencies, except

<sup>1</sup> In accepting these standards a proviso was made in regard to the question of endowment whereby contributed services (of religious) "are to be regarded as substitutes to the amount of not less than \$25,000 where services so contributed are equivalent to that amount."

<sup>2</sup> The CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW, Vol. XX, No. 6, and Vol. XXII, No. 3.

<sup>3</sup> A second clause in this standard limits the number of students in a class to 30. We have touched on this point in the second of the articles referred to above.

perhaps that referring to the endowment necessary, has given rise to more discussion than this particular standard. Thus, at the Cincinnati meeting (1921), not only was a motion to reduce the maximum load for professors to fifteen hours per week voted down, but a proposal was actually made to increase the number to eighteen. Fortunately, there were present some far-seeing members of the Committee on Standardization who realized that such a procedure would mean a step backward and effectually blocked the change proposed. However, in actual practice the standard was often violated and all sorts of excuses were brought forth to justify the nonobservance of the regulation as it stood. The attitude apparently was that if mechanics, clerks and other laborers are obliged to work from eight to ten hours a day, a college professor should not complain if he were required to teach from eighteen to twenty hours a week, especially as teachers in the grammar grades and the high school ordinarily carry a schedule even heavier than this. Such an attitude, of course, can be due only to a lack of understanding and appreciation of the motives that prompted the formulation of the standard in question. Therefore an examination of these motives will not, we believe, be out of place.

In one of the articles referred to above we have called attention to the qualifications required for teaching in college as outlined in the regulation dealing with this phase of standardization. The present standard reads: "The training of the members of the faculty of professorial rank should include at least two years of study in their respective fields of teaching in a recognized graduate school. It is desirable that the training of a head of a department should be equivalent to that required for the doctor's degree, or should represent a corresponding professional or technical training."<sup>4</sup>

Now no one is so foolish as to imagine that the possession of a master's or a doctor's degree constitutes a guarantee of a teacher's success and that his days of study are over once he begins to teach. This is true of no profession, and least of all is it true of the teacher's. To attain success, to maintain his reputation and standing, he must keep in touch with the ad-

<sup>4</sup> Bulletin, C. E. A., Nov., 1923, p. 93.



vances that are being made not only in the branches of knowledge in which he has specialized, but in all related fields. This means that he must have time for study and opportunity for self-improvement which, it is evident, will not be available if he is overburdened with the work of teaching. "Numbers of teachers in our colleges," says a recent writer on the subject, "greatly need more advanced training, more opportunity and encouragement to continued study during their teaching, and for these and other reasons considerably reduced programs of actual teaching."<sup>8</sup> This is especially true of our teaching sisters. Many of these, realizing the need of further academic and professional training, are following extension or correspondence courses from universities and colleges, preparing to fit themselves for advanced standing whenever an opportunity comes to permit their spending some time in residence at one or other of the institutions that are open to them. Undoubtedly this is a laudable ambition and one that should be encouraged and fostered; but how will it ever be realized if these same sisters are expected to teach from twenty to twenty-five hours a week in the classroom?

Moreover, we often hear the question asked, "Why do not our Catholic college professors write more?" or "Why do we have to be dependent on the labors of outsiders for our textbooks and treatises on professional subjects?" The question is a natural one, but the answer is not easily given. Surely the dearth of professional literature written from the Catholic viewpoint is not due to lack of ability on the part of Catholic educators. We are loath to believe that our Catholic men and women in the professions are less gifted with natural talents than their non-Catholic brethren, while frequently their training is certainly equal—if not actually, in many cases at least, superior—to that of many outside the fold who are considered authorities in the various fields of literary endeavor. Hence we must seek elsewhere for an explanation of the poverty of our contributions to the press. Part of this scarcity of published works is undoubtedly to be traced to lack of initiative and failure to realize the power and influence that might be

---

<sup>8</sup> Clyde Furst, *Litt. D. Bulletin*, C. E. A., Nov., 1923, p. 114.

wielded by the printed word. Many, of course, are deterred from writing by the thought of the expense involved. Catholic books are not apt to be among the "best sellers," and authors are not infrequently obliged to sustain a financial loss in the effort to get their message before the public. Not a few hesitate to "rush into print" because they are afraid of criticism, not so much from outsiders as from those within their own circle. To tell the truth, their fears are often justified. There are always some, generally those who write nothing themselves, who are ever ready to pounce upon the work of others and point out the flaws. The virtues of the work, on the other hand, are very apt to escape their critical notice.

Aside from the reasons given above, the principal cause of the scarcity of Catholic professional works is the lack of time for their preparation on the part of those who are otherwise qualified to produce them. We naturally look to our institutions of higher learning for works of this type; but, unfortunately, the ones from whom we might expect something in the line of literary effort are often so overburdened with teaching and other tasks that it is practically impossible for them to find time for research or writing. In the interests of Catholic scientific and literary production, therefore, not to speak of Catholic educational progress, it would seem the policy of wisdom to lighten the college professor's burden by reducing the number of hours he shall be obliged to teach. This would give him the necessary leisure for writing and study, and we might then, without being unfair, expect him to produce something worth while. It goes without saying that the college fostering the productive efforts of an able Catholic writer would lose nothing by the sacrifices it might be necessary to make in his behalf, for the public always associates the name of an author with the institution he represents. Witness Eliot, of Harvard; Hadley, of Yale, and Butler, of Columbia, to mention but a few of the more prominent names that are thus associated. Indeed, the college that thus provides the proper facilities for a professor or instructor renders him a debtor and can without injustice, if it be so desired, make his advancement and promotion dependent upon the use he makes of the

opportunities given him. In this respect, as in many others, "the children of darkness are wiser in their generation than the children of light." Usually the only incentive to effort offered the Catholic teacher is the supernatural one of the honor and glory of God. To be sure, this must ever remain the principal end of his endeavor, but there is not reason why it should exclude the employment of natural motives that in no way conflict with the final aim. The pursuit of a corruptible crown is not necessarily incompatible with the attainment of the incorruptible one.

Another very good reason for a reduction in the number of hours is based on the relation that exists between the length of the schedule and the character of the teacher's work. It is the opinion of those who have formulated the standard in question that "excessive teaching hours tend to dull the interest and effort of the teacher,"<sup>6</sup> and should be interpreted as endangering educational efficiency."<sup>7</sup> No one familiar with the situation will question the wisdom or truth of these statements. When a teacher is required to carry twenty, or perhaps more, class periods a week and to give instruction in a variety of subjects it is impossible for him to give the necessary time to their preparation. As a consequence, not infrequently he goes into class without the fresh knowledge of his subject that is indispensable to good teaching. The class is not slow to recognize the shortcomings of the teacher, and the results are just what might be expected: lack of interest and the consequent lack of effort on the part of the students. Many a time the teacher is blamed for the failure of his class when in all justice the blame should be placed on those higher up who "load him with burdens he cannot bear."

In this connection we think it well to call attention to another requirement of standardization which is closely allied to the one under consideration. This is the regulation specifying that the eight heads of departments, which is the minimum number now allowed for standardization, should devote full time to col-

---

<sup>6</sup> Adam Leroy Jones, Ph.D. Bulletin, C. E. A., Nov., 1922, p. 124.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Note 4, above.

lege work.\* From a comparison of these two standards it is evident that, in the opinion of the leading educators of the country, a college teacher should devote full time to the work of his classes and "full time" means not more than sixteen hours of teaching a week. The implication, of course, is that the rest of his working hours shall be devoted to the preparation of his classes and to self-improvement. The purpose of this latter standard is to do away, as far as possible, with the part-time instructor with his divided interests and to provide the college with a staff of men or women who can devote their whole attention to the task of college teaching. The object is the improvement of the college. The standard limiting the number of teaching hours has the same objective. It does not imply that during the hours a teacher is not occupied in class he may be permitted, much less obliged, to engage in the performance of tasks that bear little or no relation to the work of teaching. What, therefore, is to be said of those institutions where college teachers are expected to act as prefects of discipline, directors of athletics, superintendents of grounds and the like, and even to take part in the performance of menial tasks about the house and grounds? "But," it will be objected, "these tasks cannot be left undone." Of course they cannot; but it does not therefore follow that they should be performed by Doctors of Philosophy and Masters of Art.<sup>9</sup> The sooner it is recognized that teaching is a profession and that the man who devotes himself to it is no more a "Jack of All Trades" than the physician or the lawyer the better it will be for the cause of education generally and for Catholic education in particular. It is even questionable whether the priest teaching in college should simultaneously be engaged in the work of assistant pastor in the neighboring parish. It will do him no harm to assist occasionally in the hearing of confessions, and he may now and then accept an invitation to preach on a special occasion, but he should not be expected to perform these duties as a regular thing. As for the many other parish activities that of necessity fall to the lot of the assistant priest, they should form no part of the teacher's task as they interfere seriously with

\* Bulletin, C. E. A., Nov., 1923, p. 93.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., Art. by Rev. Thos. A. Gasson, S.J., p. 124.

the proper performance of his principal work. Nor let it be objected that he is by virtue of his ordination both priest and teacher. Only by the broadest interpretation can the Divine commission be made to include such widely differentiated functions as are today embraced in the callings of the college teacher and the city curate. For the best interests of both they should be kept entirely separate.

This separation of academic work from other forms of labor is a matter that should be insisted on in our Catholic colleges for women. With a false notion of economy, and perhaps with a mistaken idea of how the sisters are to be trained in humility, the superiors of these institutions not infrequently oblige a college teacher to help in the laundry or kitchen and to perform other menial tasks about the house. Downright stupidity would not be too strong a term to characterize such procedure did one not know that it is done in good faith and with the best of intentions. This is, however, hardly a sufficient reason to justify the actual waste incurred. It is a short-sighted policy to spend time and money fitting a sister for the profession of teaching and then permit her to wear herself out in work that might just as well be done by hired servants.<sup>10</sup>

Taking into consideration, therefore, the various factors mentioned above, which might be developed in more detail, it is evident that the maximum teaching load of sixteen hours per week is a reasonable requirement. Let it be noted that the standard stipulates sixteen hours as a *maximum*. Frequently a lighter schedule would be desirable, particularly if the teacher is engaged in writing or in research of any kind.

Even in the generality of cases, when we consider the demands made on our college teachers by their religious exercises and works of piety and charity, demands that practically speaking may be said not to exist for teachers in non-Catholic institutions, we would be justified in fixing the maximum at less, rather than more, than sixteen hours a week for each individual. In the opinion of some educators, twelve hours per week would be ideal.<sup>11</sup> At all events, let us hold firmly to the standard set by our association. By so doing we shall show our willing-

<sup>10</sup> Gasson, Rev. Thos. A., *loc. cit.*

<sup>11</sup> Ryan, Rev. Jas. H., D.D. Bulletin, C. E. A., No., 1920, p. 81.

ness to cooperate with our leaders in the efforts they are making to bring Catholic colleges into the foremost rank of American educational institutions; and we shall have abundant returns, not only from the prestige thus given our Catholic educational system in general, but from the added interest and effort that are bound to characterize the work of a body of teachers who are not crushed beneath the burden of their task.

EDWARD B. JORDAN,  
*Catholic University of America.*



## CLASSICAL SECTION

Inquiries on any phase of the teaching of the Classics are earnestly sought by the editor of this section. If these questions are of sufficient general interest, they will be answered in these columns, otherwise by correspondence. Teachers of the Classics are also urged to send us such information as devices, etc., which they have evolved through their own experiences and may wish to place at the disposal of others.

---

The following courses in the Classics will be offered at the next session (1924) of the Catholic University Summer School:

Latin I at 8 a. m. by Dr. McGourty. This will consist of a rapid survey of the elements of the Latin language with a view to introducing the student as soon as possible to the reading of easy Latin prose.

Latin IV at 10 a. m. by Dr. McGourty. An introduction to the historical background and style of the Orations against Catiline, as well as a reading of the Latin text.

Latin XV at 9 a. m. by Dr. Deferrari. A study of the Roman historians with special attention to Livy, his style and his sources.

Greek III at 10 a. m. by Dr. Deferrari. A review of the elements of Greek syntax and a careful reading of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, Book II. This course is especially designed for those who have had approximately one year's study of the Greek language.

Greek VI at 12 m. by Dr. Deferrari. An attempt will be made to read Homer's *Iliad*, Books II and III, but the course will be conducted as an introduction to the peculiarities of Homeric forms, vocabulary and syntax. Students who have had any experience with Xenophon or any other prose author will be amply prepared to profit by the work.

Other courses of special interest to teachers of the Classics who contemplate working for post-graduated degrees are Comparative Philology I, and elementary courses in both French and German.

---

Teachers interested in Latin translations of nursery rhymes

will find in the *London Journal of Education* for April 2, 1923 (pp. 210-211), several versions by Basil Anderson. Copies will be sent upon request to any teacher who writes to Professor Evan T. Sage, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

---

An innovation in textbooks has recently appeared in the form of a Caesar with "syntactic printing." The editor is Joseph H. Sheffield, and the publisher is the Sheffield Book Co., Rogers Park, Ill. The theory as stated by the editor is as follows (Preface, p. 2): "Syntactic printing shows the pupil plainly the most important words in the sentence, the words that are necessary to its structure and to its life, and it shows also less important words and the least important words." For these purposes different styles of type are used: large capitals for main verbs, their subjects and the conjunctions of a compound sentence; small capitals for subordinate verbs, their subjects and the connectives; italic capitals for introductory words of clauses dependent on a main verb, italic light face for introductory words of clauses dependent on a subordinate verb; bold face Roman for direct objects; bold face italics for substantive clauses; lower case for the least important parts of sentences, such as adjectives, adverbs and prepositions. Students in the elementary stages may find this device helpful, but it is a question whether it is necessary or even desirable to continue it throughout the second year.

---

The final report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature has just been published. This Committee was appointed by the National Educational Association, the Modern Languages Association of America, and the American Philological Association, and its preliminary report was accepted by the associations and the National Council of Teachers of English in 1913. The nomenclature recommended by the committee is in general a great improvement scientifically since under this system fewer terms will be simply labels with no necessary meaning in the pupil's mind. No teacher and no textbook maker in any of the languages considered can afford to overlook the report. Similar efforts have been made in France, England,

Austria, and Germany. Copies of the report may be secured from the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., for 25 cents.

---

In his new book, called "Junior High School Education," and published by the World Book Co., Prof. C. O. Davis, of the University of Michigan, finds that, "Of the various special languages under consideration for the junior high school, Latin has, by all odds, the best claim to recognition." Professor Davis' reasons are the value of Latin for English and for modern European languages, the fact that Latin is required for entrance to professional schools and for certain certificates and will satisfy college entrance requirements, and that, "Whatever values of formal discipline inhere in any language may be found in Latin, and to a greater extent than in most other languages" (p. 167). The fact that Latin is the language of the Church, and that any child may possess a sacred vocation and so have a practical need of Latin, are special arguments for considering Latin the language of the Catholic junior high school.

The author believes, however, that "any attempt to transplant the traditional beginning course in Latin into the junior high school is doomed to failure" (p. 171). This is very true. A much greater use must be made of special devices for teaching the language, and it must be taught in smaller doses. Cf. "Latin in the Grades," by Roy J. Deferrari, C.E.R., 1922.

---

"Miss Maude Van Cleave," of Kansas City, is making an analysis of the *Aeneid* with a view to summarizing its contribution to the subject of Roman religion. Her results will be put in such a form that they will render concrete aid to the hard-pressed Latin teacher who is trying to emphasize for her Vergil pupils certain outstanding points. Latin Notes, May, 1924.

---

The excavations to be conducted this spring by the American School at Athens will be on the site of ancient Phlius, and will be more extensive than any similar undertaking of the School in recent years owing to the generosity of Mr. George

D. Pratt, who has provided for this excavation. Mr. Pratt, who is deeply interested in archaeological research, traveled extensively in the eastern Mediterranean last year, taking the members of the school as his guests on his yacht. His gift is the result of his observation of the great opportunities for profitable exploration offered by classical sites which lie open to American archaeology as represented by the Athenian School; and in making this year's campaign possible he expressed the hope that others would be found who, sharing this view of the importance of such undertakings, would in the future provide the funds for annual excavations of this kind in Greece.

---

The following statement from Miss Julia Le Clerc Knox, of the Crawfordsville, Ind., High School, contains all essential directions for conducting a second-year Latin class:

Review the preceding lesson, making sure that the connection between it and the day's lesson is clearly understood. Assign the next lesson. Have the most difficult words and phrases, the key to the situation, as it were, written in the assignment books. Tell the class to note carefully how you translate them. Read the advance slowly, giving them opportunity to ask questions. Call on them to help in the translation when possible.

The lesson of the day is then read by the pupils in Latin. After this the translation, sentence by sentence or unit of sentence, begins. Every pupil is held responsible for contributing something to the recitation. Class criticism is encouraged. The pupils are taught to ask each other "pivotal" questions and when a mistake is made, not to *tell* the student anything but to ask such questions as will lead him to see his error and correct it himself. They enjoy this very much and with encouragement soon learn to ask discriminating questions. This exercise teaches them to think clearly. Some classes do this so well that they could conduct a recitation if the teacher is called away.

The "why" should always be emphasized in questioning, as, "Why is the subjunctive used here?" or "Why is the infinitive used there?" etc. Construction should always be stressed. It is vital to a thorough understanding of the language.

Attention to English derivatives is important. When a student hesitates over the meaning of a Latin word, his ideas clear up wonderfully if his attention is called to the English word it resembles.

Questions on the lesson that can be answered by words or phrases in the lesson are helpful, as "When these things were learned, what did Caesar do?" This is answered by "*Exploratores et centuriones praemittit.*" Why? "*Qui locum idoneum deligant.*" What for? "*Castris.*"

A summary of each chapter is given by the members of the class. This helps them to see each campaign as a unit and impresses the identity of Orgetorix, Dumnorix, etc., on their minds. It emphasizes the fact that they are reading *history* in Latin and not a mass of disconnected words. "The Standard Bearer" and "With Caesar's Legions" are indispensable in creating an interest and do much towards putting the time-honored "pony" out of business.

---

The attention of teachers of the Classics is called to the entire content of the April number of *Art and Archaeology*, and especially to an article by H. N. Fowler on "American Work on the Erechtheum." Illustrations abound throughout.

---

In a recent discussion regarding the value of specially prepared subject tests in Latin, the following pertinent remarks were made:

Latin has several inherent elements and by-products that can be tested objectively, such as a form, syntax, comprehension, gain of facility in the spelling of English words. But, above and beyond all these a faithful and competent teacher has in hand an instrument that lends itself admirably to the inculcation of habits that make for successful and useful living, namely, self-control, self-dependence, perseverance, resourcefulness and a broadening outlook upon life.

---

The Catholic University of America Patristic Series announces Volumes VI and VII as ready for distribution in June.

Vol. VI. *St. Augustine, The Orator*, by Sister M. Inviolata

Barry, of Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio, Texas. This is the first thorough and scientific analysis of those qualities of St. Augustine's oratorical art which made him the most influential preacher of his time.

Vol. VII. *The Metrical Clausulae in St. Augustine's De Civitate Dei*, by Reverend Graham Reynolds. A study of St. Augustine's use of prose rhythm in his great masterpiece.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.



## AFFILIATED HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE SECTION

### SELECTION OF TEXTBOOKS

In a few weeks the question of selecting the texts to be used during the coming year in the several classes of the affiliated schools will again be taken up for consideration. It seems therefore quite appropriate to discuss at this time, a few of the points relative to this problem and its relation to the curriculum of studies for the high schools affiliated with the Catholic University.

Except in the case of Music there is no prescription of textbooks for any of the approved studies as outlined in the syllabus. Prescription in the case of music grows out of the fact that the Progressive Series of Music has been adopted for use in the affiliated institutions of secondary grade.

As regards the other approved studies, the local school authorities are expected to select the text best suited to meet the local demands of the community which the school serves and likewise best adapted to meet the requirements of each subject as outlined in the syllabus. By this procedure a proper freedom is secured, the immediate needs of the locality are protected and the personal judgment of the members of each school's staff of teachers is given due recognition and respect.

To assist in this important duty of high school administration, the Committee on Affiliation has had prepared a list of approved texts, which, in their combined judgment, will be found both helpful and suggestive. A copy of this list will be forwarded to any affiliated high school by the Secretary of the Committee on Affiliation.

The preparation of the above-mentioned list of approved texts was made under the direction of the committee by men of wide experience as educators. These men have endeavored to select, from the large number of high school texts, books which have been prepared according to the acknowledged canons of sound pedagogics. They have been guided in their labors by the fact that the textbook is a very important factor in determining the effectiveness of the work of the pupil. For our affiliated high schools they have ranked the textbooks next to the teacher's

ability in the work of presenting the materials of each course as outlined in the syllabus. What the tools are to the artist or the artisan in their respective avocations, the textbook is to the pupil. Hence it is obvious that the selection of texts demands, on the part of those deputed for such an important duty, a proper understanding of the aims of each subject, the principles of correct method and an experience acquired in the laboratory of daily practice as a teacher. In short, they should be experts. These were qualifications of the several members of the boards, appointed by the committee for the execution of this important part of the process of affiliation.

As stated above, the list of approved texts is merely suggestive. Any teacher, with permission of the authority of the local school, has the right and the privilege to employ any text which, in his opinion, adequately treats the materials as outlined in the syllabus and measures up to the demands of the local needs. In each and every case these last two points must be kept in mind as the primary norms to be followed in the work of choosing the various texts for use in our affiliated high schools.

#### NEWS ITEMS

Loretto Heights Academy, of Loretto, Colorado, has sent in a report of the new plan of supervised study adopted for their school. A full treatment of the plan will be given in the September number of the REVIEW. The principal of the Academy reports her willingness to explain the plan to the authorities of the affiliated high schools, who might be interested.

Mt. St. Joseph's, on the Ohio, reports that among the recent notable visitors who lectured at the academy were His Grace Archbishop Messmer, Reverend Father Huffer and Rev. P. J. Howard.

St. Mary's High School, of Piqua, will in 1925 become the central high school of this section of the diocese. A new building is to be erected by the combined efforts of both St. Mary's Parish and that of St. Boniface.

St. Ann's Academy, of Fort Smith, Ark., reports extensive improvements in both their library and laboratory.

The Publicity Committee of Trinity College reports that M.

Ed. Deru, of the Liege Conservatory of Music, gave a violin recital on May 9. The new Collegiate Chapel, "Notre Dame," was dedicated recently. The celebrant of the Mass was His Grace Archbishop Curley, The Rt. Rev. Rector of the University delivered the sermon and the many friends of Trinity attended in large numbers.

Mrs. T. H. Carter and Mrs. J. J. Noonan gave illustrated lectures on "European Shrines We Have Seen" on May 4.

A very practical application of the principle of correlation has been worked out by Sacred Heart Academy, of Lexington, Ky., in the publishing of the commendable school paper, *The Exponent*. The materials of the paper are the class work of the pupils in English and History courses. The commercial pupils type and mimeograph the work, and the art students prepare the cover designs. It is quite an educative project from various angles.

A lecture on "The Trial of Christ from the Legal Point of View" was delivered at this Academy recently by Mr. Benedict Elder. "Undiscovered Country" was the title of a lecture given by Mr. Ronald Fahey, and "Religious Prejudice" was another lecture given at the Academy by Col. P. H. Callahan. Rt. Rev. Bishop Floersh recently expressed his hearty approval of the progress which had been made in The Catholic Girl Scout Movement at the Academy.

Decatur Catholic High School, Decatur, Ind., will have its first commencement this year. Rev. J. A. Steimetz, pastor and superintendent, reports that it is hoped that the new building will be ready for occupancy in September. The picture of the new school building, as shown in the commencement number of the *Tattler*, the school paper, shows that it is designed along the lines of the latest advances in school building.

LEO L. McVAY.

## EDUCATIONAL NOTES

### TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CATHOLIC EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

His Grace, Most Rev. Sebastian G. Messmer, D.D., has invited the Catholic Educational Association to hold its twenty-first annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wis. The meeting will be held on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, June 23-26, 1924. The Most Rev. Archbishop has appointed a committee of leading Catholic educators of Milwaukee to take charge of the arrangements, with Rev. Joseph Barbian, Diocesan Superintendent of Schools, as Secretary of the Committee.

The accommodations for those who expect to attend are ample, and the meeting gives promise of excellent results for the cause of religious education and sound Christian training. The annual meeting is nothing more than a general conference, but it brings the leading Catholic educators of the country together; it is a demonstration of our principles and of our position that has a national significance, and the discussions of these annual conferences lead to suggestions of a consistent unified policy that is found to meet many of the needs of our situation.

The Hotel Wisconsin will be the official headquarters of the Association during the meeting. The hotel accommodations in Milwaukee are limited, and it is desirable that those who expect to attend should make their reservations in advance and as early as may be convenient.

The religious services will be held in St. John's Cathedral, Jackson and Oneida Streets.

The general meetings and the sessions of the various departments, sections and committees will be held in the commodious halls of St. John's Cathedral High School and Parish School, adjoining the Cathedral.

Some of the meetings will be held in other educational institutions. Due announcement will be made in the official program.

#### SOME ACTIVITIES OF DIOCESAN SUPERINTENDENTS

*Brooklyn.*—The drive for material resources, so successfully conducted last year by Bishop Molloy, of Brooklyn, to finance

the Catholic high school proposition is now being followed up by a spiritual drive, the purpose of which is to interest Catholic boys in vocations to the teaching brotherhoods. Recruiting plans have been carefully worked out by the various teaching communities in the diocese; and the stimulus given to the campaign by a fervent appeal of the Right Reverend Bishop to his clergy assembled at a recent conference is expected to be productive of gratifying results.

The new Catholic high school for girls, to be known as the Bishop McDonnell Memorial High School and to cost approximately \$1,000,000, will be begun this spring. The site of this handsome structure will be near Prospect Park, the garden spot of Brooklyn; the contractors have given every reasonable assurance that the building will be ready for occupancy some time during the year 1925-1926.

*Baltimore.*—Reverend John I. Barrett, Superintendent of Catholic Schools of the Archdiocese of Baltimore, announces that one of Maryland's landmarks, the old McSherry home, situated near the Baltimore Cathedral, has become diocesan property and it is now known as Catholic Center. The building is used as offices for various diocesan activities and contains spacious quarters for the work transacted by the school superintendent.

Diocesan wide examinations were held in the parish schools this year, and the Community Supervisors have a new Course of Study in the process of preparation.

Two archdiocesan institutes, duly accredited—one at Loyola College, Baltimore, and the other at Carroll Hall, Washington—have been conducted recently for the Sisters and Brothers of the teaching communities. About 425 took the courses. Special methods in religion, reading, arithmetic, history, language and grammar comprise the subject matter treated by the Rt. Rev. Edward A. Pace, Ph.D.; Rev. George Johnson, Ph.D.; Mr. Otto G. Ramler, Ph.D.; Rev. Edward Jordan, D.D.; and Rev. P. J. McCormick, Ph.D.—all lecturers at the Catholic University. On April 7 Mrs. P. Morris Cox lectured at the University on the Beacon Method. Miss Hazel K. Forbes is scheduled to conduct a demonstration on geography methods during the latter part of the month.

*Buffalo.*—Reverend John W. Peel, Superintendent of Catholic

Schools, Diocese of Buffalo, has just issued a new Course of Studies which the New York State Department of Education has flatteringly commented upon.

REV. WILLIAM F. LAWLER,  
*Editor, Superintendents*  
*Section, C. E. A.*



## REVIEWS AND NOTICES

**Silent Reading Hour**, by Guy Thomas Buswell, William H. Wheeler and Genevieve Cooney, Catholic Edition, First Reader. Chicago: Wheeler Publishing Co., 1924.

The Silent Reading Hour, Catholic Edition, First Reader, by Guy Thomas Buswell, William H. Wheeler and Genevieve Cooney, is really not based on any specific method of teaching silent reading. It is nothing more than a rather good supplementary reading text which is to be read silently by the children. In the preface, the authors distinguish between two types of silent reading, first, reading for enjoyment or general information; secondly, reading in a careful precise manner to get specific information. The present text is supposed to give training in the first type and for that reason the materials chosen are of an interesting and entertaining character. We have here a series of real and fanciful happenings that might happen during one day of a boy's life. The technique of teaching these readers is given in a number of lesson outlines appended to the teachers' edition. There is nothing particularly new in these outlines; just a few instructions to the teacher, a number of questions to be asked when the selection has been read silently by the children. The same sort of procedure is indicated in most of the standard reading texts at the present time.

The fact that the material of this book is rather novel will recommend it as supplementary reading material. In all likelihood good results will be obtained with regard to proper eye movements, etc., on the principle that the best way to learn to read is to read copiously. The book is attractively illustrated and typographically all that could be desired. The Teachers' Edition contains a treatise on the teaching of silent reading which is a résumé of the monographs published by Dr. Buswell and his associates at the University of Chicago.

One wonders just why there should be a Catholic Edition. The distinctively Catholic features included are few and far between. There is a picture of the Vatican on the cover page which evidently is intended as a *captatio benevolentiae*. There are twelve pages of distinctively Catholic material out of 177 pages in the original book. The Catholic material is not distinctive

for its literary quality and is quite pietistic. Evidently, the *censor librorum* was off his guard when he read the story of "Jack's Guardian Angel." The sex of Angels may be a matter that has never been defined by the Church, though this is the first time the reviewer has encountered female Guardian Angels. "Catholicizing" public school books seems to be a favorite occupation of the publishers at the present time. Such attempts are a rather poor compliment to Catholic education. Happily, however, our teachers see through the conceit. These readers will not sell any better in Catholic schools because of the "Catholicizing."

Dr. Horn's contribution is of greater importance as far as the real teaching of silent reading is concerned. The very title is felicitous, "Learn to Study Readers." In the final analysis, that seems to be just what silent reading instruction should aim to accomplish. The material in this book is of a factual nature, and most of the selections give definite instructions to children to do things in line with the information they have gotten from the printed page. There are whole pages of questions that children are to answer out of their everyday experiences. There are riddles and practical exercises, such as, for instance, "What should you do when you cut your hand? When your hands are dirty? Before crossing the street?" Naturally the books are not intended as basic readers, but one can readily imagine that after beginning reading has been taught, the children will find a series of this kind very interesting, and that incidentally they will acquire at least some of the habits that are necessary for educative silent reading. It is hoped that the publishers will avoid the temptation to "Catholicize" them.

GEORGE JOHNSON.

---

**First Year Algebra**, by Milne-Downey. American Book Company. Pp. 320, with answers.

**First Course in Algebra**, by Joseph A. Nyberg. American Book Company. Pp. 336, without answers.

The report of the National Committee on Mathematical Requirements has led to the publication of a number of new textbooks. Likely there will be more. This is to be desired. The above mentioned are two of the latest written for a first class in algebra.

The main recommendations of the National Committee in regard to the teaching of algebra are: (1) The study of problems and the equations derived therefrom; (2) the intelligent use of formulae; (3) the study and construction of graphs; (4) numerical trigonometry; (5) elimination of complicated problems in fractions, factoring, etc. [The reviewer would rather that the term "First Year Mathematics" instead of "First Year Algebra" had been used.]

"First Year Algebra," by Milne-Downey is a revision of the well-known Milne algebra in the light of the above recommendations. Mr. Downey was a member of the National Committee. Among the additions is Chapter III on graphs. Herein we find an elementary treatment of the simple types of graphs in ordinary statistical use, mainly the bar and circle graph, the curved and broken-line graph. In Chapter XI the functional relation between two variables is shown graphically in the solution of simultaneous linear equation. Chapter IV is devoted to formulae. Numerical trigonometry is treated in Chapter XV. The use of the sine, cosine, and tangent in the solution of the right triangle only is shown. With an excellent class the book could be covered in one year.

"First Course in Algebra," by Nyberg, introduces graphs in Chapter III. Chapter VII is devoted entirely to graphs. The uses of the bar, circle, and proportional lines in presentation of numerical relations are shown. The coordinate system is then explained and its use in plotting simple equations is shown. Chapter VIII is devoted to sets of linear equations, the graph method of solution being first used. Numerical trigonometry is treated in Chapter XVI. Sine, cosine, and tangent are defined and their use in the solution of the right triangle is shown. It should be noted that multiplication of fractions is treated before addition. The exercises are well graded and of sufficient variety to maintain interest.

J. NELSON RICE.

---

**Hints to Preachers**, by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Hugh T. Henry, Litt.D., LL.D. Benziger Brothers, N. Y. Pp. 299. Price \$1.90.

The chapters which form this volume on preaching by Msgr. Henry, Professor of Homiletics at the Catholic University,

Washington, D. C., have already appeared from time to time in the pages of *The Ecclesiastical Review*. Hence they are familiar to that class whose business it is to preach sermons and thus escape the necessity of listening to them. However, if preaching were always as interesting as these hints about it, more people might be seen at High Mass. The author's avowed purpose is to escape the stiffness of the formal treatise on Homiletics—a laudable aim, as our own seminary experience serves to make evident. Written primarily for the priest on the mission, we should say, still reminiscently, these discussions would form a most attractive text for the seminarian seeking enlightenment as to the manner of preaching outside the seminary walls. Properly the work begins with the most important of hints, the length of the sermon, with chapters on the long sermon, the short sermon and the miniature.

Msgr. Henry's vast possession of homiletical lore from every available source, often non-Catholic, which serves so well to illustrate his principles, gives his studies that lively, companionable form which has made his classes at the Catholic University so helpful and popular. One would find it difficult to find any phase in the preparation or development of the sermon that is not touched upon by the reverend professor somewhere in these hints. An extended bibliography is included.

CHARLES A. HART.

---

**The Book of the High Romance—A Spiritual Autobiography**, by Michael Williams. The Macmillan Co., N. Y., 1924. Pp. 406. Price \$2.25.

In the new edition of a widely known story of the return to the Catholic faith of one of the country's prominent Catholic journalists there appears a supplementary chapter on the writer's life since his conversion. The story of Mr. Williams' long search for faith to direct his life has been favorably received by the literary world in America generally. The earlier edition is no doubt familiar to many of the readers of the CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. The passionate sincerity of its every page, the determination of the writer to tell the truth whatever the cost to himself, gives the book its distinct tone. Anything of the pose that often accompanies such accounts is entirely eliminated from

this simple, unaffected tale. The life of a plain man, a busy journalist who is nevertheless not too busy to seek the deeper, truer values of life—lead him wheresoever they may—can be absorbing, even intense. Indeed it is really a high romance.

The additional chapter of some sixty pages in this new edition, "In My Father's House," shows the conviction deepening, the Catholic viewpoint gradually coloring the whole outlook on life, that Catholic intuition that is no doubt the effect of the work of the grace accompanying faith itself, firmly possessed. After the high ecstasy of conversion there comes the plain, humdrum existence in the every-day life of the Church, the difficulty of living up to the dictates of the new faith. It is accepted without hesitation, for the deeper joy in the secure possession of the true philosophy of life is a power that steadies the child of the Church to make every sacrifice demanded seem still romantic. The first fruits of conversion are not lessened. Faith takes its rightful place in the whole scheme of things and unifies, secures, and deepens. If the seeking and the finding of faith is a "high romance," the dwelling therein is not less so.

CHARLES A. HART.

---

**Commonsense of the Calculus**, by G. W. Brewster, Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York, Pp. 62, Price \$0.70.

"A book which could be read in an easy chair." This little book aims to give the layman an idea of the meaning and purpose of the methods of the differential and integral calculus. It will also be of interest to one who has been away from the calculus for some time. Naturally the treatment is not rigorous; it is not intended to be so. A knowledge of elementary algebra only is presupposed.

J. NELSON RICE.

**Books Received***Educational*

Hoen, John Lewis, *The Education of Exceptional Children*. New York: Century Co., 1924. Pp. 343. Price, \$2.00.

Thwing, Charles Franklin, *What Education Has the Most Worth*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924. Pp. 225.

*Textbooks*

Camerlynck, Mme. and G. H., *Deuxieme Annee De Francais*. New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1924. Pp. 256. Price, \$1.25.

Center, Stella Stewart, *Students' Handbook, Term Plan in English*. New York City: Boni and Liveright, 1924. Pp. 64.

Clement, Marguerite, and Teresa Macirone, *Voici La France*. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1924. Pp. 288. Price, \$1.44.

Sandeau, Jules, *Mademoiselle de la Seigliere*. New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1924. Pp. 188. Price, 80 cents.

Wilkins, L. A., *Antologia de Guentos Americanos*. New York: D. C. Heath and Company, 1924. Pp. 286. Price, \$1.04.

*General*

Center, Stella Stewart, and Saul, Lillian Margaret, *A Book of Letters*. New York: The Century Company, 1924. Pp. 209.

Lahey, Thomas A., *The Morals of Newspaper Making*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University Press, 1924. Pp. 180. Price, \$2.00.

Lee, Etta, *Les Miserables*. New York: Boni and Liveright. Pp. 95.

Von Engeln and Urquhart, *The Story Key to Geographic Names*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1924. Pp. 258.

*United States Catholic Chaplains in the World War*. Ordinary Army and Navy Chaplains. New York. Pp. 356.